

T H E
True GROUNDS
OF THE
EXPECTATION
OF THE
MESSIAH.

In TWO LETTERS.

The *One* printed in the *London Journal*,
April the First, 1727.

The *Other* in Vindication of it. Being a
Reply to the *Answer* published at the
End of a late *Letter* to Dr. ROGERS,

By PHILALETHES.

D. J. A. Pykes

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. PEELE, at *Locke's Head*,
in *Pater-Noster-Row*. MDCCXXVII.

(Price 1 s.)

THE GROUND

EXPLANATION

MESSIAH

THE GROUND

EXPLANATION

MESSIAH

THE GROUND

EXPLANATION

MESSIAH

THE GROUND

EXPLANATION

MESSIAH



*The True Grounds of the Ex-
pectation of the MESSIAH.*

IN TWO LETTERS.

LETTER I.

To the Author of the LONDON JOURNAL.

S I R,



S a great deal of Pains has been taken of late, by one of great Acuteness, to examine into the *Grounds and Reasons of Christianity*, and to vindicate what he has said; it may not be improper at this Season to entertain your Readers with some Considerations upon what he has suggested about *the Expectation of the Jews of a Messiah to come out of their own Nation.*

He allows, " That there was in and about the Time of J E S U S, a very great Expectation among the *Jews* of a Person to come, who was to *redeem them by Arms* out of the State of Misery and Slavery under which they groaned." The Account that he gives of this Expectation, is, " that it has no *real Foundation* in the *Old Testament*, and therefore could only proceed from the *Sense of the Oppressions* they were under; and the *same Reason*, says he, *holds for the Continuance of that Notion.*"

This Solution would have had some Air of Probability, had this Author been able to produce any parallel Instance from any other Nation whatever. It was not peculiar to the *Jewish Nation* to be oppressed; to be harrassed by foreign Armies; to be subject to the Emperors of *Rome*; to be taxed, or to be plunder'd by Soldiers: Why therefore, should these Hardships raise in the *Jews* alone so *peculiar an Expectation*? Whence is it that no other Kingdom in *Europe*, in *Asia*, or in *Africa*, that was conquered by the *Romans*, or by any one else, ever expected such a *Deliverer* upon such Occasions? Had no one else any *Sense of Oppression*? Or what was there *peculiar* in the *Jewish Oppressions*, *peculiar*, I say, to Them, which should raise these Hopes?

Our

Our Author himself, in the Account he gives us of the State of the Expectation of a Messias among the *Samaritan Jews*, readily acknowledges, that “ *one would think they should naturally speak* ” of a Messias “ *as a Matter of Belief and Comfort,* ” considering the poor, the afflicted, the miserable State in which these People live in *Sichem*. And yet these Difficulties never raised any Expectation of a *Temporal* Messiah in them; nay, our Author declares, that to him, “ the *Samaritans* do not appear to have ever “ been so far possess’d with the Notion of “ a Messias, as to have taken up Arms under the Conduct of any one who pretended to that Character; tho’ they have “ upon diverse Occasions made Revolts “ and Insurrections, and even attempted “ to set up a King among them; and “ tho’ by being an *oppressed People*, and “ living all together in one Territory, “ they were better qualified to set up a “ Deliverer, or *Messias*, than the dispers’d “ Nation of the *Jews* were. ” How comes it then to pass that these unhappy, *oppressed Samaritans*, so much *better qualified* than the *Jews* to set up a Deliverer, yet have never “ been possess’d so far with “ the Notion of a Temporal Messiah ” as to attempt any thing under the Conduct of such a Person?

This

This Author conjectures, that the *Sad-
duces* were not so generally under the Ex-
pectation of the *Messias* as the *Pharisees*
and *Essenes* were. And his Reason is,
“ that they pretended to adhere only to
“ the literal Sense of the Scriptures, and
“ to reject the allegorical and traditional
“ Sense thereof; upon *which only* the
“ *Jews* cou’d justly ground their Ex-
“ pectations of a *carnal* or victorious
“ *Messiah*. ”

Whatever grounds there may be for this
Conjecture, the *Reason* here assign’d can-
not be true. For the *Jews* grounded
their Expectations of a *Temporal* Deliverer
upon Passages taken according to the *mere*
Letter; and by too close adhering to *That*,
where they ought to have understood
Places *figuratively*, they fell into their
Mistakes. But this is not what I would
remark. Those *Jews* who were as utter
Enemies to *Allegories*, to *Traditions*, to
Inventions of Men, as any ever were,
are, and in fact have been, as strict Be-
lievers of a *Messiah* as any: I mean the
Caraites. These Men are scrupulously
attached to the *Letter* of the Bible, and
never explain the Scripture by Tradition,
but only by the Light of *Reason*; by
which alone they endeavour to understand
the Scripture, and to draw natural and ne-
cessary

cessary Consequences from the Law. These Men expect the *Messiah* as well as the other *Jews*; and therefore what our Author imagines, that the Expectation of a *Messiah* arose from *allegorical* and *traditional* Senses of Scripture, is entirely groundless. The *Caraites* were so much Enemies to *Traditions*, that they thought the *Talmud* to be nothing else but mere *Reveries*; and as they opposed the other *Jews* in all their groundless allegorical Notions, whence is it that *These* Men have found out the Notion of a *Messiah*, but in *literal* Prophecies?

But what I would principally observe is, that the Question in Debate is not, whether the *Jews* expected a *carnal* or *victorious* *Messiah*, or not? That may make a very proper Question betwixt *Jews* and *Christians*, viz. under what *Circumstances*, or in what *Manner*, the *Messiah* was to appear. But the Debate at present is, whether *any such* Person is prophesied of in the Old Testament at all? That is the Point to be settled, before we can enquire whether He was to be a *Temporal* Prince, or a *Spiritual* one; it being ridiculous to debate about an *Attribute*, or a *Property*, if there be no Substance, or Being, to which such Property can belong. And consequently, 'tis foreign to the Question

tion to tell us what one uninformed *Jew*, or another, thought or said of him in the *New Testament*; unless it be proved that every *Jewish* Opinion, every Notion, which there happens to be mentioned, is true; and that every one of the *Jews* was free from Prejudice, and understood the Old Testament according to its true intended Meaning.

Again, allowing that the Disciples, or the Apostles themselves, had Expectations, at *first*, of a *Temporal* Messiah; and allowing too, that *Josephus* had no Expectation of a *Messiah* that should arise out of *his Nation*; (which last can never be proved;) and admitting too what *Rabbi Hillel* said, *That there was to be no Messias in Israel, because they had him in the Days of Hezekiah*: Yet what does all this amount to against the general Belief, that there was to be a *Messiah*? The *Apostles* might have their Prejudices, which might reasonably be, and in fact were, *afterwards* proved to be groundless ones: *Josephus*, by applying the Oracle he speaks of, whatever that was, to *Vespasian*, necessarily supposes that there *was* such an Oracle: And *R. Hillel*, by saying that the *Jews* had the *Messiah* in the Days of *Hezekiah*, supposes that there was to be one: and the Question then would be, whether

whether the *Messiah* were *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, or *Hezekiah*, or any one else.

These Things therefore being discarded as foreign to the present Purpose; and it appearing that the *Sense of the Oppressions* which the *Jews* lay under, was not sufficient Foundation for the Expectation which the *Jews* had of a *Messiah*; we must search for the Notion in *Antiquis Sacerdotum Libris*, where *Tacitus* tells us, it was thought to be contained, *i. e.* in the *Old Testament*. There we find great *Promises* made by God to *virtuous People*; plain Predictions of future Times; Prophecies of a Time when *all Nations shall be gathered unto God*; when He would *set up a Kingdom that should never be destroyed*; when the *Jews* should return to their own Land, and *all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the Seed which the Lord hath blessed*. These and many other Prophecies are represented as to be accomplished by Means of some *One particular Person*, who was *to reign and prosper, and execute Judgment and Justice upon Earth*; whose Name was to be call'd *The Lord our Righteousness*; who was to have *Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom, that all People, Nations, and Languages should serve him*: *His Dominion is an everla-*

sting Dominion, which shall not pass away; and his Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

When therefore An Enquiry is made into the Grounds of the Christian Belief, no more seems to be meant but this: Have the Authors of the Old Testament prophesied of some *One Person* to whom God has promised a *Kingdom and Dominion*; and by whom God designed to bring about such and such great Events in the World? If there be such *Prophecies*, of such a particular Person, this is what the *Jews* mean by their *Messiah*; whom indeed they still *expect*; and this is what we *Christians* mean when we say, that *Jesus* is The *Christ*: He is that Person by whom God will accomplish what was spoken in the Prophets.

I cannot therefore but conclude, in direct Contradiction to what this acute and learned Author asserts, *viz.* That the Expectation of a Messiah *had* a real Foundation in the Old Testament, and did *not*, could *not*, proceed from the *Sense of the Oppressions* which the *Jews* lay under.

I am,

S I R,

Yours, &c.

PHILALETHES.

L E T T E R II.

S I R,

I Have carefully considered the *Answer* you have been pleased to give to the Letter which I published in the *London Journal*, on *Saturday, April 1st, 1727*. I know not whether I have a *Right* to say, that the Author of *The Scheme of Literal Prophecy consider'd*, and the Author of the *Letter to Dr. Rogers*, and of the *Answer to the Letter in the London Journal*, is the same Person. The Style, the Way of Writing, the peculiar Method of of quoting Authors, and the incidental unguarded speaking of *yourself* as the Author of the *Scheme*, seem to point out so plainly the *same* Hand, that I think I can't be mistaken. If you are the *same* Person, it will not be improper to introduce what I have to say upon this Occasion, with the Consideration of a Passage in the *Scheme of Literal Prophecy consider'd*: If you are *not* the same, I beg your Pardon for troubling you with a Passage in which you are not concerned.

It is in the *Scheme of Literal Prophecy* asserted, that those against whom the Bishop writes, *i.e.* the *Deists*, " are not concerned to name the Persons intended

B 2

" by

“ by the Prophets; nor to find out *Mean-*
 “ *ings* for the Prophets, and to make those
 “ *Meanings* to be fulfilled, or else to ac-
 “ knowledge them to relate to a *Messiah*,”
 p. 110. Again, p. 112. The Bishop’s
 “ Adversaries may be justly excused from
 “ being obliged to assign *Meanings* FOR
 “ the Prophets, as well as from *yielding* to
 “ the *Meanings assigned by others*.” And
 again, p. 124. “ They are not obliged to
 “ show how any Prophecy in the Old Te-
 “ stament was ever fulfilled.” Now,

The Design of the present Controversy
 is to name “ a *Person* intended by the Pro-
 “ phets,” to “ *find out the Meaning of*
 “ *the Prophets*,” and to urge what they
 have said in such a Manner, that Adver-
 saries may “ *yield to the Meaning assign’d*
 “ *by Others*,” if they are not able to assign
 better Reasons *against yielding*, than can
 be produced *for* it. When a Question is
 started, whether there be any Prophecies of
 a *Messiah*; and Prophecies are produced
 out of the Old Testament; and ’tis shewn
 that such a Passage was design’d as a Pro-
 phesy of the *Messiah*, and that it agrees to
Jesus of Nazareth ---- Is it reasonable for
 an Adversary to say ---- That he conceives
 himself “ justly excused from yielding to
 “ the *Meaning of the Prophet assign’d*,”
 unless he is able to *assign another*, and a
 better

better Meaning ? 'Tis said, That Deists may be "justly excused from being obliged to assign Meanings for the Prophets." Surely they are to act by these as they do by all other Books. If a Place be obscure, or unintelligible, in the Prophets, I agree that That ought not to be made the Subject and Foundation of the present, or of any, Controversy. But then I think that a *Meaning* may be assigned to Their Writings, as well as to other Mens: That where the Context, the Terms made use of, the Connection is intelligible; there 'tis but equitable to demand of the Deists that they *yield* to what is assign'd as the *Meaning*; just as it is reasonable to require assent to an Interpretation of a Passage of *Virgil* or *Cicero*, where the Words and natural Construction shew what it was that the Author intended; unless they can shew that the Meaning assign'd is not the Meaning of the Author.

For my Part, I cannot but suppose it *possible*, that a Prophecy may be given by God; and likewise that a *Person* may arise, or an Event may happen, that may exactly agree to, and may be intended by, that Prophecy. When a Dispute is on foot, Whether there be any Prophecies of the Messiah? Whether there is any Foundation for supposing that such a Person as
the

the Messiah “ ever *literally accomplished* “ *any Prophecy?* ” If any one will *concern* himself so far as to intermeddle in these Disputes, I think he is *concern'd* either to “ yield to the Meanings of the Prophets assign'd by others, ” or to shew that such *Meanings* are not intended in the Prophets. The Expression indeed made use of by the Author of *The Scheme of Literal Prophecy consider'd*, viz. That He is not “ concern'd to find out Meanings FOR the Prophets, ” would make one suspect that he look'd upon the Prophecies of the Old Testament to be no better than the Reveries of Enthusiastic Madmen, which had really *no Meaning* at all; and then indeed I own he is “ not “ obliged to assign *Meanings* FOR the “ Prophets, or to yield to the Meanings “ assign'd by Others. ” But then the State of the Question is entirely chang'd; and the Dispute should not be, Whether *Jesus* is the *Messiah*, foretold by the Prophets in the Old Testament? But, Whether there be any real Prophecies at all in the Old Testament? or were the Prophets any thing else but mere *Madmen*? and whether what they said had *any Meaning* at all?

But I will not charge you, SIR, with this Notion; I proceed immediately to the Debate betwixt us.

I ob-

I observed that the Author of the *Scheme, &c.* had asserted and maintained this Position, That the Expectation of a *Messiah* " has no *real Foundation* in the "*Old Testament*; and therefore could " ONLY proceed from the *Sense of the* "*Oppressions* they (the *Jews*) were under; and the *same Reason*," says he, " holds for the Continuance of that Notion. " Upon this I denied that the Solution here produced had the Air of Probability; and intimated that the Author was not able to produce a parallel Instance in any other Nation whatever, who expected a *Messiah* from the *Sense of their Sufferings*.

The Answer you give is, " That nothing is more easy than to give numerous " Examples in almost all Countries — of " People *oppressed*, who naturally cast about for Ways of Relief, giving into the " Notion of a *Deliverer*, according to " their Occasions for such a one; whom " they sometimes expect from Heaven, " as well as from among Men: for " ENTHUSIASM, which is frequently " *raised by and joyn'd to Distress*, helps " forward the Perswasion among Men, " that they shall have a Deliverer. " Do not you see, SIR, That the Position, which I said would not account for the Notion

Notion, is, that “ the *Expectation* of a
 “ *Messiah* could ONLY proceed from a
 “ *Sense of Oppressions* : ” And you, to
 prove that That ALONE wou’d account
 for it, now tell us that it proceeds from
 ENTHUSIASM *joyn’d to Distress*; i.e.
 That proceeds from Distress, and some-
 thing else, which proceeds ONLY from
 Distress.

But you name an Instance as parallel to
 that of the *Jews*. “ The *Huguenots*,
 “ who were expelled *France*, soon fell
 “ into the *Expectation*, that they should
 “ be restored and resettled in their native
 “ Country; and some of them pitched on
 “ the *Prince of Orange* for their De-
 “ liverer, whom they then thought they
 “ saw clearly mark’d out to them in the
 “ Bible. ” The Difference of the Cases
 seems to me so clear, that I can’t but
 wonder you should mention the Instance
 of these *Huguenots* as parallel to that of
 the *Jews*. The one is the Case of Persons
 at Home, in their own Country, not un-
 der any eminent or remarkable *Distress*,
universally, or at least, *generally* expect-
 ing a Redeemer: The other, of Persons
 bitterly persecuted, drove from Home,
 naked, and in the utmost Want, turning
 their Eyes upon a Person, who was look’d
 upon, as having Common Principles of
 Religion,

Religion, and a known Enmity to the King of *France*, and in point of common *Politicks*, was likely to take upon himself their Defence: And if any were so foolish as to look into the Bible for Marks of the Prince of *Orange*, they were very few; it was not done generally, much less universally. And what is principally to be observed is, that now the Person from whom they expected immediate Deliverance is dead, they do not continue to look out for *Another*, as the *Jews* still do, and have done constantly, even where they are, or have been, no more oppressed than the *French Refugees* are now.

You go on, and tell us, that “ the
 “ *Jews* were an *Enthusiastic* People,
 “ thinking themselves *Favourites of Heaven*. — They have not only the common
 “ Cause of other Men to set up the *Ex-*
 “ *pectation* of a *Deliverer*, but to be
 “ more strongly possessed with it than o-
 “ thers; and as continuing under the
 “ greatest Oppressions, to continue under
 “ that *Expectation*: And accordingly,
 “ from the Time that they got into their
 “ Heads their most *extravagant*, *un-*
 “ *grounded*, and *chimerical* Notion of a
 “ Deliverer, they have been more agreed
 “ and fixed in that Expectation, (for they
 “ were not unanimous in that *Expectation*
 C “ till

“ till many *Centuries* after *Jesus*) under
 “ numerous and great Disappointments,
 “ and the utmost Hardships and Sufferings,
 “ for acting in pursuance of their Expecta-
 “ tions of a Deliverer. Of whom it is to
 “ be observed, that they have often
 “ changed their Ideas in respect to his
 “ Birth, Family, Country, and Time of
 “ his Appearance, --- and have been sted-
 “ fast in no Part of his Character, but
 “ that of a Warrior, who is to lead them
 “ to *Jerusalem*, and set up a *Jewish*
 “ Kingdom, and Worship in a new
 “ Temple, which he is to build. ”

To all this I reply,

First, That this is no Answer to any
 thing in my *Letter*: It concerns *Enthu-*
siasm joined to a *Sense of Oppressions*; of
 which it was impossible that I should
 speak, because the Author whom I was
 refuting, had not spoke a Word about this
 Matter. But however, this New Hypo-
 thesis will not account for the Difficulty.
 For,

Secondly, Supposing that where *En-*
thusiasm and *Oppressions* meet, there the
 Effects you mention *will* follow; yet you
 are to *prove*, what you all along take for
granted, and what I do deny, *viz.* that
 the *Jews* at our Saviour's Time (when
 you

you allow this Expectation to have been) acted upon these Principles; or that *Enthusiasm* join'd to their *Distresses* was the Cause of their Expectation at that Time. For if their Prophets did really speak of some one particular Person, who was to deliver the *Jews*, and to set up a Kingdom among them, then what you call *Enthusiasm*, will be strictly rational.

Thirdly, It is not yet proved, nor I think can be proved, that, at the Time you fix for the beginning of the Notion of a *Messiah*, the *Jews* were under such great *Oppressions*, such mighty *Hardships* and *Sufferings*. *Jerusalem* indeed had been taken by *Pompey* about sixty three or sixty four Years before *Jesus* was born; but still the *Jews* were under no particular *Oppressions*. *Josephus* mentions several Decrees made in Favour of the whole *Jewish* Nation, not only those *Jews* who lived at *Alexandria*, but in *Judea*. *Cæsar's* Letters are extant, wherein the *Jews* are discharged from Publick Payments; and they are admitted to be *Friends* to the *Romans*. *Marc. Antony* treated them as his dear *Friends and Allies*; and ordered them Satisfaction for the Mischief they had suffered under *C. Cassius*. *Herod* was in high Favour with *Augustus* and *Antony*: And *Augustus's* Decrees in their

C 2

Favour

Favour are recorded by their own Historian. They had paid no *Tributes*, no *Taxes* to *Rome*, when the Notion of a *Messiah*, according to your own Account of it, was first started; and they were govern'd by their own Princes, and by their own *Laws*. So that a *Sense of Oppression* could not be the Cause of this *Expectation* at first, since the Expectation was general at *Jesus's* Birth, when no *great Hardships* had been put upon that Nation; and consequently, this Effect is not owing to the Cause you assign.

But put the Case that the *Jews* were an *oppressed* People, at the Time when you say this Notion of a *Messiah* began, and add that they were as much *possessed* with the Notion as you please; yet it is no where to be parallel'd in any History, that *Enthusiasm joyn'd with Distress* has worked in this one particular Way upon People for *seventeen or eighteen hundred* Years together, and *constantly* made them *expect* their Deliverer. Will neither *Ease* nor *Plenty* alter the Circumstance in the least? Will no Appearances of Persons who have assumed the Characters of the *Messiah* cure them? No Disappointment make them relinquish a Notion which has no better Foundation than the *Jewish* Expectation, according to your
Solution,

Solution, has? This is such a Phænomenon, that I might justly ask, as I ask again, What is there so *peculiar* in the *Jewish* Oppressions which should raise such incurable Hopes, which neither freedom from Oppressions, nor very frequent Failures in those who have pretended to be their *Messiah*, can ever root out?

Fourthly, You say, that the *Jews* “ were not *unanimous* in the Expectation “ [of a Messiah] till many Centuries after “ *Jesus*.” This is *asserted* by you, but not *proved*; nor do I think that you can prove it. It was not indeed made an Article of their Creed, “ till many Centuries “ after *Jesus* : ” But notwithstanding that, *R. Albo*, who denied it to be a *Fundamental* Article, yet believed it to be a *true* one; and his Expression was, He that denied the Messiah was guilty of but a *little Breach of the Law*. If you are able to cite an Instance of *One* who said the *Messiah* was *already* come, *viz.* in *Hezekiah*’s Days, yet that will not prove that the *Jews* were not as unanimous then, as at any other Time: *i. e.* there were always, and always will be, some particular Persons, who for one Reason or other will be *singular* in their Notions. As no one ever intended to plead for so *absolute* and *strict* an *Unanimity* as to comprehend every particular

ticular *Jew*, without the Exception of any *One*; when you say, they were not unanimous in their Expectation till *many Centuries* after *Jesus*, you might as truly have said, that they are not now, that they never were, nor never will be *unanimous*. But this would be too much playing upon the Word *Unanimous*.

Lastly, 'Tis nothing to the Purpose to say, that the "*Jews* have often changed " their Ideas in respect to the Messiah's " Birth, Family and Country." For admitting this to be true, yet they have always agreed in this, to expect their *Messiah*. Those *Jews* expect him, who live in *England* and *Holland*, free from any *Hardships* or *Oppressions*, as well as those, and as much as those, who live in *Spain* and *Portugal*, under the Horrors of the Inquisition. And if they have changed their Ideas in respect to some Circumstances, yet still nothing makes them change their Expectation of that Person of whom their Prophets have spoken.

You proceed thus in your Answer. " You attack the Solution, " [*viz.* that the Expectation of a Messiah arises from the Sense of Oppressions] " from the Case of " the *Samaritans*; but in such a Manner, " that I do not pretend to understand " you." I'll endeavour to explain my Meaning. The

The Author of the *Scheme*, &c. gives the "State of the Expectation of a *Messias* among the *Samaritans*" in this manner. "In *Jesus's* time it should seem "that they generally expected a *Messiah*:" That no mention is made of any Notion or "Expectation of "any *Messias*" in the *Samaritan* Chronicon; which reaches down (says that Author) to the 628th of *Jesus*: [This is a Mistake, for it does not reach down so far by above 400 Years: But this by the by.] That in Answer to the Letter wrote by *Scaliger* to them, They only say, "*Petijsti de Messia. Quod est nomen ejus apud nos, nisi Hascbeab? Et quis hoc intelligit nisi Dominus?*" That "they never were so far possessed with the "Notion of a *Messiah*, as to take up Arms "under the Conduct of any one who pretended to that Character:" That they were "an *oppressed* People, and living altogether in *one Territory*, they were "better qualified to set up a *Messias*, "than the *dispers'd* Nation of the *Jews* "were."

This, SIR, is the Account of the State of the Expectation of the *Messiah* amongst the *Samaritans*: And your Solution of that Expectation among the *Jews* being, that it could arise *only* from the *Sense of their Oppressions*, I reason'd thus, --- The *Samaritans*

samaritans were an *oppressed* People as well as the *Jews*: The same Causes will naturally produce the same Effects; and consequently *Sense of Oppression* would operate upon the *Samaritans* in the same manner as it did upon the *Jews*. The *Samaritans* had made “ upon divers Occasions, “ Revolts and Insurrections, and even attempted to set up a King among them.” The *Jews* have made many *Revolts* likewise. How comes it then to pass that the *Samaritans*, the *oppressed Samaritans*, I’ll add now, the *Enthusiastic distressed Samaritans*, so much *better qualified than the Jews to set up a Deliverer*, have never “ acted in pursuance of their Expectations “ of a Deliverer,” as the *Jews* have? How is it that the People that are confessed to have the *same Principles*, and *better Opportunities* to put them into Practice, yet never have attempted anything under the Conduct of such a Person?

Your Answer is, “ Certainly they might “ *expect a Messiah*, and yet not rise up “ in Arms under the Conduct of a *Messiah*.” This is certainly a good Answer upon the Supposition of their founding their Expectation upon other Grounds: But if their Expectation arises *only* from the *Sense of Oppression*, or from *Enthusiasm join’d to Distress*, ’tis unaccountable that

that it should never operate upon them under all their "Revolts, Insurrections, " and Attempts to set up a King," as it has worked upon other People who have had the *same Notion*, i. e. the *same Cause*; that in Seventeen Hundred Years a Cause should never *once* produce its natural Effect; that if their constant Expectation was of a *Deliverer near at hand*, as you call it, that no one should assume the Character of their Messiah in so long a time. I add, that, allowing *Enthusiasm joined to Distress* to be a very active Principle, and supposing it will make Men expect a *Deliverer near at hand*; yet it is not to be conceiv'd, that for so many Years together it should continue to operate upon any Nation. The *Huguenots* might be persuaded that the Prince of *Orange* would be their present *Deliverer*; yet does the Expectation *still* continue of another Deliverer, who should do what the Prince of *Orange* did not? The strongest Enthusiasm is not more wild and extravagant, than such a Solution seems to me to be.

You proceed next to examine this Assertion of mine, *viz.* That the Expectation of a Temporal Deliverer was grounded upon Passages in the Old Testament taken according to the mere Letter, and that by too close adhering to the

D

mere

mere Letter *they fell into their Mistakes*. Your Answer to this is in these Words.

“ You offer no Proof of this Fact, nor
 “ can you produce any Proof thereof:
 “ For it does not appear, that the *Jews*
 “ had any such Expectation for several
 “ Centuries after the Books of the Old
 “ Testament were published; or that
 “ they made any false Interpretations
 “ of the Old Testament; or mistook it
 “ about that Matter. If they did, be
 “ pleased to produce those mistaken Interpretations, as Proofs of your Assertion.

“ Besides, I do not see what reason
 “ you have for assigning the Hypothesis
 “ of interpreting the Bible according to
 “ the *mere Letter*, without regard to the
 “ Sense of Places, as the *ground* of the
 “ *Jews Expectation*. I deny—that the
 “ *Jews* went antiently on that Scheme.
 “ —Would it not be absurd to make
 “ the *Jews* to have argued *originally*
 “ for a *Messiah*, and to have used all
 “ those ridiculous Interpretations they
 “ have done since the Expectation of a
 “ *Messiah* became fixed and rooted among them, unless you cou’d actually
 “ fix such Interpretations *originally* upon
 “ them?”

In

In reply to this I must observe,

First, That the *Jews* in our Saviour's Time plainly expected a *Messiah*; and they founded their Expectation upon the Books of the Old Testament. The Virgin *Mary* says, *Luke* i. 54, 55. *He hath holpen his Servant Israel in remembrance of his Mercy, as he spake to our Fathers, to Abraham, and to his Seed for ever. Zacharias* says, v. 69, &c. *God has raised up an Horn of Salvation in the House of his Servant David: As he spake by the Mouth of his holy Prophets, which have been since the World began: to perform the Mercy promis'd to our Fathers, and to remember his holy Covenant: the Oath which he swore to our Father Abraham that he wou'd grant unto us.* When our Saviour was born, the chief Priests and Pharisees from a Text of the Old Testament told *Herod* where the *Christ* was to be born, namely in *Bethlehem* of *Judah*; for thus it is written by the Prophet, *And thou Bethlehem of Judah art not the least among the Princes of Judah; for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my People.* You must own, that these People founded their *Expectation* of a *Messiah*, (whether right or wrong is not the Question at present) upon the Old Testament.

Secondly, It is agreed by both of us, that the *Jews* expected that their *Messiah* would be a *Temporal* Prince; one that was to redeem them by *Arms* from that state of Subjection under which they were. This too they founded upon the Old Testament, as appears very clearly from what *Zacharias* says concerning *Jesus*, that he was the Person *spoken of by the Prophets*, who should *save Israel from their Enemies, and from the Hand of all that hated them*, Luke i. 71.

Thirdly, You have fixed the beginning of this Expectation “about our Saviour’s Time:” and it has been just now shewn, that the *Jews at that Time* grounded it upon the Old Testament. The Jews therefore argued *Originally* for a Messiah from Passages in the Old Testament, supposing *your own Account* of the *Origin* of this Expectation to be true. When therefore you argue, that one ought to produce Instances how the “*Jews argued originally for a Messiah:*” and observe, that “Men, when once
“possess’d with a Notion, may think
“they see it every where, and find it
“out in Places that give not the least
“Colour for it; but they do not naturally fall into so much Absurdity at the
“*first broaching a false Notion.*”——

When

When you reason thus, you seem to forget that their Interpretations are as old as the *Origin* of the Expectation of a *Temporal* Messiah, and are Evidences how the Jews argued *originally* for a Messiah, according to *your own* Hypothesis. But,

Fourthly, I said that the Jews *grounded their Expectation of a Temporal Deliverer upon Passages taken according to the mere Letter*. Your Answer is, that I “can’t produce any Proof thereof.” The reason of your Assertion is, “FOR it does not appear that the Jews had any such Expectation for several Centuries after the Books of the Old Testament were published.”

The contrary to this *appears* to be true; for the Prophet *Malachi* lived but 400 Years, or thereabouts, *before* Christ: and instantly *after* Christ’s Time this Expectation is called an *Old and constantly received Opinion* among the Jews. (*VETUS & constans Opinio*, are the Words of *Suetonius*.) Now if it were an OLD Opinion just after Christ’s Death, and there were but 400 Years from *Malachi* to *Jesus*, how did “*several Centuries*” pass after the Books of the Old Testament were published before this Expectation began? However, supposing what you say to be true, ’tis
no

no Argument against what I had affirmed: For let the Jews have had the Expectation of a Temporal Deliverer, when the Books of the Old Testament were first published; or let it be *many Centuries* after; 'tis all one in respect to what I said, *viz.* That they founded their Expectation upon the Letter of the Old Testament. I have *proved*, that at the time fixed by *your self* for the *Origin* of their Expectation, they argued from Passages of the Old Testament: and to *you* that ought to be sufficient. You go on thus, "It does not appear that the Jews made any *false* Interpretations of the Old Testament, or *mistook* it about that matter." If they argued *originally* from it, as has been shewn according to your own Scheme, and did *not mistake* the Old Testament as you say, then you must allow their Interpretations to be *true*; and their Expectations to be founded upon *true* Interpretations of the *Old Testament*, and not to have arose from the *Sense of their Oppressions*.

Lastly, Whereas you say, you do not see any reason "for assigning the Hypothesis of interpreting the Bible according to the *mere Letter*, without regard to the Sense of Places, as the Ground of the *Jews* Expectation." I answer.
The

The *Jews* expected a *Temporal Deliverer*; and this was grounded upon the Old Testament. The Prophets had declared from God, that *David* (many Years after *David*, the Son of *Jesse*, was dead) *should be their Prince for ever*, Ezek. xxxvii. 35. This, and such other Places, was understood of a *Temporal Kingdom*, and a *Temporal Messiah*, as implying, that *God would*, literally, *give unto him the Throne of his Father David*, and *he should reign over the House of Jacob for ever*, and of his Kingdom there *should be no End*, Luke i. 32, 33. They argued rightly, and understood the Prophet right, that the *Messiah* was to reign *for ever*. But then they imagined, that because he was to *reign for Ever*, therefore he was *never to die*. And this was the reason that the *Jews* answered our Saviour when he talked of his Death; *We have heard out of the Law, that Christ abideth for Ever: How sayest thou, The Son of Man must be lift up?* John xii. 34. They took the Words of the Prophets in the first and obvious Sense, without regard to the *real* and *true* Sense intended by Him that inspired the Prophets, and without considering how God would make the *Messiah* reign for Ever, and yet die. This naturally led them

them into the very *Mistake* which they were guilty of. And hence it was that the Disciples of our Lord ask, *Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?* *Acts* i. 6. imagining that the *Messiah's* Kingdom was to be such a Kingdom as *David's* was: and that Jesus was then to *continue* with them.

You see, SIR, an Instance of one of the “mistaken Interpretations” of the *Jews*, and that founded on what I call the *mere Letter*. Because *David*, i. e. their Messiah so called, was to reign *for ever*, therefore they imagined that their Messiah was *never to die*, but was to *abide* for ever: He was to *abide* with them, as they thought, and reign over them as *David* did; but with this difference, that the Messiah was to continue *for ever* with them, whereas *David* reigned but 40 Years.

However, imagine that I was mistaken in what I took to be the ground of the *Jews* Expectation: It was a mere *Incident*; and what I did not insist upon, nor does it affect the Question in Debate. The Author of the *Scheme*, &c. had laid it down, that the Allegorical and Traditional Sense of Scripture “was the only
“one, upon which the *Jews* could justly
“ground their Expectations of a carnal
“or victorious *Messiah*.” In answer to this

I just observed, that the *Jews* by adhering too close to the *Letter* fell into their Mistakes. However, that was not what I intended as an Answer; but this: That the *Caraites*, who were utter Enemies to all *Allegorical* and *Traditional* Senses of Scripture, expect the *Messiah*, as well as other *Jews*: From whence the Inference is very clear, That these Men found out the Notion of a *Messiah*, not in *allegorical*, *mystical* Interpretations, but in *Literal* Prophecies.

To this you answer, " That this will
 " not in the least serve my purpose, to
 " prove that *any Jews* *anciently* found
 " ed their Expectation of a *Messiah* on
 " the mere *Letter* of the Bible; or that
 " the *Caraites*, who seem a very *modern*
 " Separation from the *Jews*, did so."

How the *Jews* *anciently* acted in this Affair has been already shewn. That the *Caraites* are *not* a *modern* Separation from the *Jews*, as you assert, take these Authorities. *Wolfius*, in his Preface to his *Notitia Karaeorum*, p. 7. tells us, that *Caraism* was in being many Years before the Birth of Christ. And p. 8. that the *Scribes* in the New Testament, were chiefly *Caraites*: That *Orbio* (the *Jew* that had the famous Controversy with *Limborch*) was wont to say, that

E

our

our Saviour himself was a *Caraites*, as (a) *Trigland* tells us. Monsieur *Basnage* says, (b) That the Origin of the *Caraites* is older than that of the *Sadduces*. Again, (b) *We find the true Origin of the Caraites, who began to appear under this Prince, Ptolomy Philometor*: And then he explains several Passages of the New Testament, as relating to them. *Scaliger* thought them older than the *Sadduces*: *Karaim priores tempore sunt quam Sadducæi*. I acknowledge that *F. Simon* places them no higher than the Eighth Century. But then he does this only from the Authority of the *Rabbini-cal Jews*, who are as bitter Enemies and as gross Abusers of the *Caraites* as ever lived. (c) *If one considers*, says he, *the Histories which have been wrote by the Rabbins, one shall find, that those who have spoke most exactly, have not put the Origin of Caraim higher than the Eighth Century*. But then

(a) *Diatribes de Secta Caræorum*, p. 215. or p. 66.

(b) *Histoire des Juifs*, Li. 2. c. 8.

(b) Nous trouvons là la véritable origine des Caraites, qui commencerent à paroître sous ce Prince, Ptolomée Philometor. *Basnage Hist. des Juifs*. lib. 2. c. 9.

(c) Si l'on fait Reflexion sur les Histoires qui ont été écrites par les Rabbins, on trouvera, que ceux qui ont parlé le plus exactement, n'ont rapporté l'origine du Caraimisme qu'au viii. Siècle. *Hist. Crit. du Vieux Test.* l. 1. c. 29.

Trigland, in his *Diatribē De Secta Caræorum*, has defended *Scaliger* against Father *Simon* and *Morinus*, and has proved his Point beyond all Dispute. And *Wolfius*, who has Republished *Trigland*, has maintained the same Notion. Dr. *Wotton* (d) has proved, that the *Caraites* are as old as the *Maccabees*; and insists, that the *Scribe* that is (e) mentioned, *Matt.* xxii. 34. was a *Caraitē*. I refer the curious Reader to *Trigland's* Dissertation upon this Subject, who inquired more into, and certainly understood better, the History and Notions of the *Caraites*, than any other Person whatever. See also *Wolfius's* *Notitia Karæorum*.

This may suffice to shew, how groundless your Assertion is, that the *Caraites* are a *modern Separation* from the *Jews*. I shall next consider the Reasons you have assigned, why the *Caraites* did not found their Expectation of the *Messiah* upon the *Letter* of the Law.

Your *first* is, that I “ quote no *Caraitē* Books (which are all Modern, and withal so few, that the *Jews* speak of the *Caraites* as *Dumb Dogs*, who have published no Books) to shew their Method of interpreting the Bible, in

(d) *Wotton's Miscellaneous Discourses*, Vol. 1. p. 81, 89.

(e) *Ibid.* p. 78.

“ relation to the Matter of the *Messiah* ;
 “ without producing which, you say, I
 “ have no Right to conclude, they did
 “ proceed in interpreting the Bible ac-
 “ cording to the mere *Letter*, and to have
 “ been scrupulously attached to *that*.”

I own I quoted no *Caraitish* Book ;
 and the reason was, that I thought their
 Method of interpreting Scripture so well
 known, that it was perfectly unnecessary.
 However, I will supply that Defect as
 soon as I have observed, 1. That the A-
 busers, and ill Names that the *Rabbini-
 cal Jews* cast upon these People, are not
 to be regarded : They hate them to such
 a Degree, that they will never (a) *in-
 termarry with them, how advantageous
 soever the Match might prove.* (b) They
 will not *continue together in the same
 Place* : Nay, the *Rabbins* carry their
 Aversion so far, as very rarely to admit
 any *Caraite* as (c) a *Profelyte* ; and have
 a Proverb among them, *That a Caraites
 ought to become a Mahometan, or a Chri-
 stian, before he can be receiv'd amongst
 the Rabbinical Jews.* If therefore the
Rabbins call these Men *Dumb Dogs*, or
 use even worse Expressions concerning

(a) La Republique des Heb. lib. 3. c. 8. Basnage Hist.
 des Juifs. Lib. 2. c. 9.

(b) Ibid.

(c) Ibid.

them,

them, yet when one Sect professes such open Hatred to another, what they say is not to be regarded, unless we have very good collateral Evidence. 2. When you say that *THE Jews* speak of the *Caraites* as *Dumb Dogs*, you should have said that *ONE Jew*, viz. *Rabbi Abraham Ben Dior*, speaks of them in that manner; for his Words do not imply that That is the *common* Appellation of them among the *Rabbinical Jews*. His Words are (d) *The Hereticks*, i. e. *Caraites*, *never did any good to Israel, nor have they published ANY Book to confirm the Law, nor any Word of Wisdom, no not ONE Song, nor any one Lesson of Comfort: but they are all Dumb Dogs, they cannot bark.* Which are so many Lies told of these People; for they have wrote several Books of several sorts, as is fully shown by *Wolfius*, and others.

To shew you now upon what Grounds I said that *these Men* are scrupulously attached to the Letter of the Bible, and never explain the Scripture by Tradition, but only by the Light of Reason, by which alone they endeavour to understand

(d) Hæretici, [Caraitæ] nihil unquam boni Israeli præstiterunt, nec librum ediderunt ullum ad Legem confirmandum, aut verbum Sapientiæ, etiam ne Canticum unum, vel Solatium unum; sed omnes ipsi Canes Muti, non possunt latrare. Wolfius Præf. ad Notitiam Caræorum, p. 4.

the Scripture, I will cite several Authors who were well acquainted with their Books. Dr. Cudworth says, (e) that *they reject all Talmudical Traditions which are not grounded on Scripture*. Again, *They have rejected the fond Traditions of the Pharisees*. Father Simon says, that the *Caraites* (f) *by their very Name pretended that they had truer and better Sentiments of Religion than the other [Jews] whom they accused to have in a sort abandoned the Word of God, to follow the Glosses of the Rabbins*. And again, (g) *they examine with Care the Text of Scripture. They always bring into their Aid their Reason, which judges if the Consequences which they draw from Scripture follow necessarily and directly; and if what is called Tradition be really such; and whether it has ever been interrupted*. Monsieur Basnage expresses it thus, *They are scrupulously attached to the Text of the Scripture* (a).

(e) Cudworth on the Lord's Supper, p. 41. *ibid.* p. 64.

(f) Pretendirent fair voir par là, qu'ils avoient des Sentiments de la Religion plus epurés que les autres, qu'ils accuserent d'avoir en quelque facon abandonnée la Parole de Dieu pour suivre les Glosses des Docteurs. Hist. Critique du Vieux Testam. p. 160.

(g) Ils examinent avec application le Texte de l'Ecriture : — ils font toujours venir au secours leur Raison, qui juge si les consequences qu'on tire de l'Ecriture suivent necessairement & immediatement, & si ce qu'on nomme Tradition est tel en effet, & s'il n'a jamais ete interrompu. *Ibid.* pag. 163.

(a) Ils sont scrupuleusement attachez au Texte de l'Ecriture. Hist. Juifs. l. 2. c. 8.

And again, (b) *They do not explain the Scripture by Tradition, but only by the Light of Reason, which serves them to understand the Words of Scripture, and to draw natural and necessary Consequences from the Law.* As clear and as strong as these Testimonies are, that you may not pretend that I quote no *Carait* Book in order to shew their way of interpreting the Bible, I'll give you one Quotation from a *Caraitish* Author. (c) *The Caraites have explain'd the Law according to its literal, simple, and true Sense, which doth not contradict sound Reason.*

From these and many such Authorities, I concluded that the *Caraites* rejected all *Allegorical* and *Traditional* Senses of Scriptures. Now if, as you say, *Allegorical and Traditional Senses* of Scripture are the Only ones upon which the Jews cou'd ground the *Expectation of a Messiah*, I think I may fairly ask, How came these *Caraites* by their Notion of a *Mes-*

(b) Ils n'expliquent point l'Ecriture par la Tradition, mais seulement par la lumiere de la Raison, qui leur sert a entendre les paroles de l'Ecriture, & a tirer de la Loi les consequences naturelles & necessaires. *Ibid.*

(c) Illi [Caræi] explicarunt Legem secundum sensum literalem simplicem ac verum qui cum sana ratione non pugnet. *Wolffius* Notitia Caræorum, p. 72. See also *Trigland's* Dissertation, where many Quotations to this purpose are made.

siab?

siab? Whence cou'd they have it but from *Literal* Interpretations of Prophecies? If they had it not from thence, be pleased to assign some other Source of this Expectation, consistent with their avowed Principles.

Your *Second* Reason to prove me mistaken about the *Caraites* is this, “ The
 “ *Caraites* can't be said to be great Enemies to the *Inventions of Men*, when
 “ they pretend to ground the Expectation
 “ of a Temporal Messiah, which is a mere
 “ *Invention of Men*, on the Scripture.
 “ And I wonder how you can ask, whence
 “ the *Caraites* have found out the Notion
 “ of a *Messiah* but in *literal* Prophecies? And how you can speak of them
 “ as Men interpreting the Scripture by the
 “ Light of *Reason*, when even you must
 “ allow, that there is no Foundation for
 “ their *Messiah* in the *literal* Prophecies, that is, in the Prophecies understood in their primary Sense, in the
 “ Sense intended by the Prophets; and
 “ when the Hypothesis of the mere Letter is, according to you, a false Hypothesis for interpreting the Bible, as leading the Jews into their mistaken Belief
 “ of a temporal Messiah?”

How far the *Caraites* are “ Enemies
 “ to the Inventions of Men,” is plain from this, that they have their Name
 from

from hence, because (a) rejecting Traditions they tenaciously adhere to the written Law alone. But notwithstanding that avowed Enmity, it does not follow but that the *Caraites* may be mistaken as well as other Men. However, the Instance of the *Caraites* is strong against you, because you said, that *the Allegorical and traditional Sense of Scripture was that, upon which only the Jews cou'd justly ground their Expectations of a carnal or victorious Messiah*; whereas these Men expected a Messiah, who yet rejected all *allegorical and traditional* Senses of Scriptures.

You wonder how I can "speak of them as Men interpreting the Scripture by the *Light of Reason*, when I must allow that there is no Foundation" (you mean, I suppose no *just and real* Foundation) "for *their Messiah* in the *literal* Prophecies, *i. e.* in the Prophecies understood in their primary Sense; in the Sense intended by the Prophets." I am so far from not allowing what you

(a) Rejēctis traditionibus παρρησιασθέντες, soli legi scriptę tenaciter adherescunt. Trigland Diatribe, c. 2.

Karzi Talmudicam traditionum farraginem—non admittunt, in solo sacro Codice acquiescentes. Wolfius Pręf. p. 6.

Karzos in exponenda Scriptura, relictis fabulis, sensum literalem, & ex visceribus contextus deducendum sectari. ibid. p. 5.

F

say,

say, I must not allow ; that on the contrary, *I do allow* that “ there is Foundation (such as it is) for their Messiah ” in the *literal* Prophecies ; nay, I say that by *too close adhering to the Letter all their Mistakes are owing*. The Sense intended by God that inspired the Prophets, is certainly the *real Sense* of the Prophecies : the *literal Sense*, which I am here speaking of, is that which the *mere Letter* holds forth, and may in many cases be a *false* one, as not being the *real* Sense intended by God. *Literal* Prophecies are opposed to Prophecies interpreted *mystically* throughout the present Debate : and consequently the *Caraites*, who reject all *mystical* Interpretations, must ground their Expectations on *Literal* Prophecies. But then the *Literal* Sense is either *proper*, or *improper* : The *improper* Sense, is what the Words themselves in their common Acceptation signify, tho’ the Speaker does *not intend* that Signification. The *proper* or real *Literal* Sense is that which the Author *intends*, whether he uses Words in their common Signification, or whether he uses figurative Expressions. The Jews therefore grounded their Expectation upon *Literal* Prophecies, in Opposition to *Mystical* : and at the same time mistook the
Impro.

Improper, for the *Proper*, *Literal Sense*. The Hypothesis therefore as you call it of the *mere Letter*, or the *Improper literal Sense*, is a false Hypothesis for interpreting the Bible; and yet still to pursue the *Proper* literal Sense, or the Sense intended by the Author, is what is right, and what affords sufficient grounds to expect the Messiah.

Your *Third Reason* is introduced with several Mistakes. You say “*John Lewis Frey*, Professor of *Basil*, made some “*Extracts from a Comment made by a “Caraité Author on the Pentateuch, “which Extracts are extant in Manuscript in the Library of the Fathers of the Oratory at Paris.*” The *Comment itself* from whence the *Extracts* are taken is indeed in that Library; but *Frey’s Extracts* were *published* by himself to the World, and never were in that Library you mention.

You go on, “*From which Extracts, “which were communicated to Wolfius of Hamburgh by the Favour of Father Le Long of the Oratory, he, i.e. Wolfius, gives an Account of the Method “which the Caraité Author pretends to “use in his Interpretation of Scripture.*”

Those *Extracts*, as I said, were *published* by *Frey*: *Le Long* never “*com-*
 F 2 “*muni-*

“ *municated them to Wolfius.*” But being Library Keeper admitted Professor Frey to the Books. But this by the by.

From these *Extracts* from the Book entitled *Mubchar, or the Election*, you tell us that the *Caraites* really do use and pay “ a Regard to Allegories and Traditions,” tho’ they “ pay a less Regard than the Other Jews.”

My Answer to this is in the Words of *Basnage*, who mentioning an Objection from the *Caraites* using the Points of the *Masoreths*, which are founded on Traditions, says, (a) ‘Tis to play with the Term Tradition, to prove that the *Caraites* make use of it, because they make use of Points. And again, (b) They acknowledge but Two Lights to conduct themselves in Religion: The one is the Lamp of Scripture; the other that of the Understanding: They never explain Scripture by Tradition, &c. If you’ll take a *Caraites* Word for this, take it as ’tis cited by *Trigland* in *Wolfius*’s Edition, p. 285. in the other Edition, p. 153. (c) and with that

(a) C’est de jouïr du Term de Tradition, que de prouver aux Caraites qu’ils s’en servent, parce qu’ils ont adopté les points. *Basnage Hist. des Juifs.* l. 2. c. 8.

(b) *Ibid.*

(c) Laudabilis interpretandi Scripturas apud eos lex obtinet, ut Rationem quidem adhibeant, tanquam scrutini instrumentum. Ipsas vero literas Sanctas, & dictata Prophetarum

that take likewise *Trigland's* Opinion. His Words are, *They have a commendable Rule of interpreting Scripture: They use Reason as the Instrument in their Searches, but the Scriptures and the Declarations of the Prophets as their Touchstone and sole Foundation.* The *Caraite* is *R. Eliabu in Adderet*, who says, (d) *Every Interpretation, whose Truth is found out by Reasoning and Deduction, if it agrees with the Words of the Prophets, we say of it that our Enquiry is true, because the Conclusion agrees to Truth. The Light of the Law and the Light of the Understanding, are, as it were, Two Lights in our Hands.*

The *Caraite* whom *Trigland* wrote to, and whom *Wolffius* has published, tells us how far they admit *Traditions*. Where, says he, *there is a perfect Unanimity, (e)*
there

phetarum ut lapidem Lydium & unicum fundamentum.
Triglandii Diatribe.

(d) Omnis Expositio cujus veritas eruitur ope ratiocinii ex uno aliud inferentis, si cum Dictis Prophetiæ conspirat de ea dicemus, nostrum Scrutinium est verum Scrutinium, quoniam ejus conclusio consentit veritati. Suntq; velut duæ Lampades in duabus manibus nostris Lucerna Legis nostræ, & Lucerna intellectus nostri. *Ibid.*

(e) Constat traditionem omnem eandem in ore omnium Traditionariorum esse debere, ita ut omnes eam profiteantur. Quæ res si ita haberet, nos quoq; in illa innireremur, & recumberemus, sicut acquiescimus in traditione nostra quæ a doctoribus nostris p. m. vocatur onus hereditate acceptum, & doctrina continua serie ad nos deducta. *Wolffius's Notitia Karae-*

there they receive them; and they reject the Rabbinical Traditions, because one says one thing, another, another. Whereas were they unanimous, we also would acquiesce and rely upon them, as we acquiesce in our Tradition, which is called by our Teachers, an hereditary Burden, and a Doctrine uninterruptedly derived to us.

I leave the Reader now to judge, whether since the *Caraites* expect the *Messiah*, there must not be another Ground for that Expectation, besides the *Allegorical* and *Traditional* Sense of Scripture; which, according to you, is the ONLY Ground of such a Notion.

But before I have done with this Matter, I must take Notice of your Conclusion about these People. They have a Notion about the Delay of the Coming of the Messiah, which you refuse to *determine* whether they founded it *upon Reason or on Scripture*. They say, as you tell us,
“ the

Karaorum, p. 69, 70. *V. Wolfius's* Note upon this Place. It is the same with *Vincentius's* Rule, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. *Basnage* at large shews, that as Protestants cannot be said to admit Tradition, because they explain a Passage as *St Jerom* has explained it, or because they kneel at the Lord's Prayer, tho' *Jesus Christ* has not commanded it; so the *Caraites* are not to be charged with admitting Tradition, because they receive the Points invented by the *Masoreths*. The *Caraites* do Two things, 1. Ils rejettent les Dogmes importants, qu'on a adjoutez a la Loi, qui est suffisante pour le Salut. 2. Ils ne veulent pas qu'on egale les Traditions indifferentes a la loi. *Histoire des Juifs*. l. 2. c. 8.

“ the coming of the *Messiah* is delayed be-
 “ cause of the slow Motion of *Saturn*,
 “ which is the Star of the *Sabbath*, and of
 “ the *Jewish* People.” Not to take Notice
 of less Inaccuracies; *who* are the People that
say this? The Reader is to suppose that
 the *Caraites* say this. But your Author
 says, that (f) *in their Opinion who are*
Astrologers, the Reason of this Delay is
 owing to the Cause assign’d. It was easy
 therefore for you to have determined,
 whether the *Caraites* founded this Notion
 on *Scripture*, or *Reason*, since, 1st, it is
 not the Notion of the *Caraites*; nor 2^{dly},
 is it pretended to be founded on either
Scripture or *Reason*, but merely on *A-*
strology. I fear I have said too much on
 this Topick, I proceed therefore to your
Answer.

You tell me that I “ have two Para-
 “ graphs concerning what is the Question
 “ in Debate, which I say is not, whether
 “ the *Jews* expected a carnal Messiah, or
 “ not, — but whether any such Person be
 prophesied of in the Old Testament at
 all?” I own I think the Question is, Whe-
 ther any such Person as the Messiah is pro-
 phesied

(f) Ex sententia eorum qui *Astrologia* (not *Astronomia*,
 as *Trigland* has render’d it) sunt periti, si moretur Messias
 ea de causa est quod Stella Sabbati est Stella Israelis. *Twigl.*
Diatribes. p. 160. *Wolffius*, p. 291.

phesied of at all? And this is first to be determined before we can enquire whether his *Dominion* be *Temporal* or *Spiritual*, or both. Your Answer is, "That you do not understand this:" That "the Term, *Messiah*, not being defined by me, has no Meaning."

At the same time, tho' you do not *understand* me, yet "you are *satisfied*, that I cannot clearly state any Question which can be resolved from the *literal* Sense of the Old Testament, so as to serve my Purpose." And that "by my Method, the Matter to be proved, or the Thing signified by the Term, *Messiah*, will hereby be reduced to nothing." If I ask, why? the Answer is, that I have "excluded you from making him a *Temporal* or *Spiritual* Person;" from "making him to arise out of the *Jewish Nation*;" and that I "have excluded all Consideration of *Time* out of his Character."

I much mistake, if I have not spoke explicitly to the Things which are to be consider'd, by saying what I did at large in the two last Paragraphs of my former Letter, which I will re-consider presently. However, what I take to be the Meaning of the Term, *Messiah*, is, One particular Person, that was foretold by God, to whom he design'd to give a *Kingdom*, which should
never

never be destroy'd. A great many *particular Events* were to be brought about by this Person, during his *Dominion* and *Kingdom*, for which the Prophets are to be consulted; but I do not name them for this plain Reason, that till it be determined, whether there be any Person prophesied of, to whom a Dominion and Kingdom is to be given, which is all that the Word, *Messiah* means, it can signify nothing to talk about what other things he is to do. And for this Reason, I said, "we must search for the Notion of a *Messiah*, in *Antiquis Sacerdotum Libris*, where *Tacitus* tells us, "it was thought to be contained, *i. e.* in "the Old Testament." And I will here add, that the Notion of the *Messiah*, or of one, *who should obtain the Dominion over all*, was deem'd in *Vespasian's* time, *i. e.* about 36 Years after the Death of Christ, to have been *vetus & constans opinio, an ancient and constantly received Opinion*; whereas you would have it to be no older than Christ's time; with what consistency do you judge.

The plain Question therefore is, Has God, in the Prophets, any where spoken of a particular *Kingdom* which he would erect, which should never be destroyed; and of a particular *Person*, whose Dominion was to be an everlasting Dominion?

If he has done this, then the natural Enquiry is, who is That *Person*? And what is That *Kingdom*? Is this to “make the
“ Matter to be proved, or the Thing signi-
“ fied by the Term, *Messiah*, nothing.”

You tell us, that “according to *Tacitus*, we must search the Old Testament for a Prophecy about *Vespasian* and *Titus* “for
“ that is the Prophecy *Tacitus* speaks of,
“ who believed in *Josephus*, or such *Jews*
“ who denied there was to be a *Messiah*
“ to arise out of their Nation, and only
“ thought there was a Prophecy in their
“ Books relating to *Vespasian* and *Titus*.”

But what Authority have you to say that *Tacitus* believed in *Josephus*, or such *Jews*, who denied that there was to be a Messiah to arise out of their Nation? Does he say so? Does any one else? No. *Tacitus* indeed tells some Circumstances of the Taking of *Jerusalem*, agreeable to what *Josephus* has related about them. But, supposing them to be true, surely *Tacitus* might relate them as well as *Josephus*.

2. Why must “we search for a Prophecy
“ about *Vespasian* and *Titus*.” *Tacitus*, it seems, speaks of a Prophecy which he applies, as others had done, to *Vespasian* and *Titus*: *i. e.* He speaks of some Passage, said to be in the Old Testament, which was thought to belong to them. But as
you

you have exprefs'd your felf, one would be apt to think that one ought to look for an exprefs Paſſage, where *Titus* and *Vefpaſian* are named by Name in the Old Teſtament: Which neither *Tacitus*, nor no one elſe ever imagined.

You ſay, that I “ mention ſuch Paſſages,
“ or rather refer to, and cite a Parcel of
“ Phraſes, and tack 'em together, which
“ when conſider'd, will be ſo far from
“ ſhowing any Notion contained therein,
“ to ſerve my Purpoſe, that the very Con-
“ text every where will ſhow me ſome-
“ thing ſubverſive of it.” I anſwer,

What here you call a “ *Parcel of*
“ *Phraſes*,” are direct diſtinct *Propoſi-
tions*, all affirming ſome plain full Truths:
and conſequently they are ſuch as, if falſe,
may be *confuted*; nay you your ſelf at-
tempt to *confute* them, which is evidence
that you think them to be *Propoſitions*.
For who ever went about to confute a
Phraſe, unleſs the Diſpute be about Pro-
priety of Terms; which you your ſelf ne-
ver inſinuate to be the Caſe here.

My Words are, “ We find Prophecies
“ of a time when *all Nations ſhall be ga-
“ thered unto God; when he would ſet
“ up a Kingdom that ſhould never be de-
“ ſtroyed; when the Jews ſhould return
“ to their own Land, and all that ſee*

“ them shall acknowledge them, that they
 “ are the Seed which the Lord hath blef-
 “ sed. *These and many other Prophecies*
 “ *are represented as to be accomplished*
 “ *by means of some one particular Person,*
 “ *who was to reign and prosper, and ex-*
 “ *ecute Judgment and Justice upon Earth,*
 “ *whose Name was to be called the Lord*
 “ *our Righteousness: who was to have*
 “ *Dominion and Glory, and a Kingdom,*
 “ *that all People, Nations, and Langua-*
 “ *ges should serve him.*” &c.

Your Answer to the first of these Prophe-
 cies is, “ I BELIEVE the Terms, *all Na-*
 “ *tions,* in the Places where they are to
 “ be found, never signifie the whole
 “ World; nor the Terms *gathering unto*
 “ *God,* mean any thing but the *gathering*
 “ unto God’s House to worship, or to see
 “ the *Jews* worship at *Jerusalem*; which
 “ *gathering* is visibly to be accomplished
 “ in a short time after the supposed Pre-
 “ diction.”

The Contexts which you say are subver-
 sive to my Purposes, are not by you pro-
 duced; but all that you say to the first
 Prophecy produced is, I BELIEVE the
 Terms, *all Nations,* never signifie all the
 World. Now if they never do signifie so,
 then it only follows that *all the World* is
 not to be *gathered unto God*; which makes
 nothing

nothing against the Point in Hand. As to the other, *Gathering to God*, I desire you to produce any one Instance in the Old Testament, where it signifies meeting “to see the *Jews* worship at *Jerusalem*,” or to prove that such Places were fulfilled so visibly soon after the Prediction.

2. You ask “How does a Prophecy, that “*God would set up a Kingdom that should never be destroyed*, serve your Purpose, when it does not appear to be “a *Jewish* Kingdom, nor a remote Kingdom?” I answer, Whether it be a *Jewish* Kingdom, or not, is not the Point in Debate. It was to be *Kingdom*. That it was to be a *remote* Kingdom, is plain from the time when it was to begin. and that it “took place before the *Jews* Expectation of a Messiah can be proved “to have begun,” is what is *gratis* said by you, and is false in fact, and therefore can never be proved. You enquire,

3. “How does a Prophecy, that when “the *Jews shall return to their own Land, all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the Seed which the Lord hath blessed*, appear “to refer to Times remote from the Times “when that Prophecy was supposed to be “delivered.” I answer, Read the Context, and let any Person judge whether
what

what is there said can be forced to a Time near the Times when the Prophets lived. *Isaiab*, lxi. v. 4, &c.

You ask next, “ How does it appear, “ that these Prophecies before recited are “ to be accomplished by *some one particular Person*, when sometimes no particular Person is mentioned, and when “ one and the same Person cannot be “ proved to be meant to be the Agent in “ all those Places, where some particular “ Agent is mentioned; and when some- “ times that Agent is one Person, some- “ times another.” I answer, That the Kingdom foretold is to belong to *One Person and but One*, whose *Dominion is an everlasting Dominion which shall not pass away, and HIS Kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed*. Where- ever the Circumstances of Things do point out the Times wherein they are to happen; and one Person is the Supream Lord and Governor in those Times; and no one else is ever mentioned; and the Things to be done are agreeable to his Character; from hence 'tis reasonable to infer, that that one Person is the Agent referr'd to.

You go on thus, “ How does that Person “ appear to be the Person, who in *Jere- miah* is to execute Judgment and Ju- “ stice on the Earth, who thro' Mistake
you

“ you say is called the Lord our Righteousness?” I answer, That the Prophet is speaking of a Time when the Jews shall be restored to their Land, *when they shall fear no more, nor be dismay’d, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord. Behold the Days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute Judgment and Justice in the Earth. In his Days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is his Name, whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness.* This was never true of the Times of the Return from *Babylon*, and therefore does not belong to those Times: and ’tis exactly suitable to the whole Tenor of what the Prophets say in relation to those Times, when the Jews shall be in Possession of their own Land under the Messiah.

But as to this particular Prophecy of *Jeremiah*, you tell me, I am mistaken in saying that that Person shall be called the Lord our Righteousness; and say, “ that that Name, which is but twice “ used in *Jeremiah*, is in one place the “ Name of *Israel*, and in the other, the “ Name of the City of *Jerusalem*, of “ which it is said, *she shall be called, the* “ Lord

“ Lord our Righteousness.” In both which Assertions I think the Mistake on your side. For in the 23d Chapter ’tis not *Israel* that is to be call’d, *the Lord our Righteousness*, but the *King* of whom he is speaking, who is to reign, when *Israel* shall *fear no more*: And the Construction is, *This* is his Name by which *Judah* and *Israel* shall call him, not *Israel* be call’d. In the 33d Chapter, v. 15, 16. the Prophet says, *In those Days, and at that Time will I cause the Branch of Righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall execute Judgment and Righteousness in the Land. In those Days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and he that shall call her [is] the Lord our Righteousness*; which is the literal Translation of the Place. *Jerusalem* therefore is not call’d by that Name, as you assert, nor *Israel* neither.

When you add, “ that the Context
 “ sets forth that that Person who is to
 “ *execute Judgment*, is to *reign* in *Judah*
 “ after the Jews return from the *Babylonish*
 “ Captivity, and seems to mean, as
 “ *Grotius* says, *Zerobabel*.” If you can
 prove That, why do you cite *Grotius*,
 whose Authority you will not take when
 He is against you; and you know ’tis Ar-
 gument, not Authority, that I both urge
 and

and require. However, to shew you that it is not *Zarobabel*, He never was *King* of the Jews; in his time neither *Juda*, nor *Israel*, nor *Jerusalem*, dwelt safely; nor are any of the Characters agreeable to him, or his Times; and therefore the Prophet speaks of a time when their Circumstances will agree to some *other* Person, at whatever Distance of Time, whether few or many Years from the Times of the Prophet.

All that you say in your next Paragraph concerning my using *Phrases*, is to me perfectly unintelligible. I have cited *Propositions* from the Prophets, and I propose them to your Consideration in what I think is their *real* Meaning, as the Inspirer of the Prophets intended them. Whether I, or your self, have pleaded for, or proceed "in, a *Mystical* " or *Surenhusian* Method," I am content to leave to the Reader: the Passages I referr'd to in the Propositions I cited from the Prophets, you know very well, and you have accordingly given the Answer, which, I suppose, you judge to be the strongest; and you need not have "confined me to " the Citations I made Use of in my Letter;" for as I did not design to recede from them, unless you cou'd have shewn that I had mistaken their Meaning; so you may easily perceive that, in my Letter, I cou'd not design any other

H

thing

thing, than just to hint, that I thought you had strangely involved the Question, and just to point out to my Reader what I thought was right.

As to your last Question, “ How does
 “ it appear that all the Passages above,
 “ which you say I must allow do not
 “ prove the *Jews* Hypothesis of a *Tem-*
 “ *poral Messiah*, were the Foundation of
 “ the *Jews* Notion?” I answer; What-
 ever Passages were the Foundations of
 the *Jewish* Notion of a *TEMPORAL*
Messiah, the Passages I have produced
 were *sufficient* Foundations for Them, or
 for any one else to expect *the Messiah*, or
 that Person to whom *Dominion* (whether
 that Dominion be *Temporal* or *Spiritual*)
 is promised, and who is foretold, or pro-
 phesied of, in the Old Testament. Ac-
 cordingly I observed that the true En-
 quiry was, *Whether the Authors of the*
Old Testament have prophesied of some
One Person, to whom God has promised
a Kingdom and Dominion, and by whom
God designed to bring about such and
such great Events in the World? If
 there be such Prophecies, this Person is
 what is meant by the Term, *Messiah*, and
 we Christians say that *Jesus of Nazareth*
 is that Person.

“ *This Account*, you say, *is too gene-*
 “ *ral*, and serves no Purpose without
 “ some

“ some more particular Explication of
 “ what I say. I must name the E-
 “ vents design’d to be brought about —
 “ and that, by setting down precisely the
 “ Events. I must also define what I
 “ mean by Dominion and a Kingdom.”

As to Kingdom, I mean what I think the Prophets mean, the Regal Power and Authority of One over many ; and by *Dominion*, I mean the Power of enjoining Laws, and inflicting Penalties, or granting Rewards, according as Subjects obey or disobey Commands. And here I will add, that our Saviour has properly *Dominion* and a *Kingdom*. He reigns over his Subjects Supreme above all Kings, nay Kings themselves own him for their Lord and Master. His Laws are superior to all others, and have a prior Obedience paid them. If any Laws in any Christian Country are contrary to Christ’s Laws, the Subjects of Christ refuse Obedience to them, and will sooner part with Life itself, than pay Obedience to them. The Sanctions of his Laws have the greatest weight above all Sanctions of human Laws. What is *Dominion*, and what is a *Kingdom* if this is not ?

As to naming *more* particular Events, which you require, I must say it is nothing to the purpose, unless you are ready to admit the Prophecies of a peculiar

Kingdom and Dominion, promised to a particular Person who was to arise remote from the Times of the Prophets; and then it will be time enough to proceed upon them. But if you do not allow thus much, what's the Use of naming more Particulars?

When therefore you say, "suppose
 " a Christian would prove the Truth of
 " Christianity to a Deist, and as the first
 " Article of the Christian Faith would
 " prove to him the Truth of *Jesus* be-
 " ing the *Messiah*, promised in the Old
 " Testament; must not the Christian de-
 " clare to the Deist the *full Notion* of the
 " *Messiah*, so as to make it square to *Je-*
 " *sus* alone"? When you ask this, you
 ought to tell us what you expect under
the full Notion of the Messiah. For if
 you mean *every particular* Action that
 the *Messiah* has done, or is to do, it may
 be very hard to do this, and 'tis altoge-
 ther unnecessary. In the present Enquiry
 'tis sufficient to shew, that *Jesus* was the
 Person to whom God has given the *Do-*
minion which he foretold that he would
 give. But then to give the *full Notion*
 of the *Messiah*, you must take in not only
 what is foretold concerning Him in the
 Old Testament, but likewise what was
 afterwards revealed in the New? *E. g.*
 God will judge the World by the *Mes-*
siab,

siab, or by *Jesus*, is a plain Truth reveal'd in the Gospel, and will enter into the *full Notion of the Messiah*, as it is discovered to us by *Jesus*: and yet this can't be prov'd to be a Part of the *Messiah's* Office from the Old Testament. What therefore is to be proved from the Old Testament, is to be kept distinct from what the New Testament has added; and yet for any one to give the "*full Notion*" of the Messiah, what is said in *Both* Testaments must be considered.

The Argument for the Truth of Christianity is a complex Argument; and necessarily takes in a great deal more than Prophecy to make it full. To convince a Deist, I apprehend that the Method is this; first to show that God did design in his Wisdom, to send a *particular Person* into the World, to whom He had promised a *Kingdom and Dominion*. This I conceive, at least I think thus for my self, the Foundation of the Expectation of a *Messiah*. *Jesus of Nazareth*, when he came into the World, declared himself to be *That Person*, the King of that Kingdom, which God designed to erect. But then our Saviour's *saying* that he was *The Christ*, ὁ Χριστός, would be nothing, unless he *proved* himself to be what He pretended. Here therefore the *Works* of our Lord come in, as a *second Part* of the
the

the Argument, whereby he *proved* himself to be what he declared himself. And when these in all their Parts are fully considered, let the candid and impartial Lover of Truth judge, whether there be not Evidence sufficient to make a Man BELIEVE, (for this is the true scriptural Notion of Faith) *that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God*, John xx. 31. *Prophecy* must always make a *Part* of the Argumentation; because the Words, *The Messiah*, necessarily presuppose it: But then, as *The Messiah* was to do several things, he must produce such Evidence of his coming from God, that reasonable People might have ground to believe from the Evidence produced, that whatever was to be done, if it were not done at one time, it would be done at another.

I think this Method of Reasoning is so far from being form'd upon what you are pleas'd to call "mere *Phrases* tacked "together," and "independent *Phrases*," that you cannot name any one thing capable of being proved from the Old Testament, which I cannot with equal Justice call by the Name of *Phrases*. If direct and full *Affertions*, full and clear *Propositions*, which contain manifest Truths, are to go under the Name of *Phrases*, pray how *many* of these must be allowed, before we can arrive at any thing

thing else but *Phrases*? If one Proposition is but a *Phrase* with you, are *Two*, or *Two Hundred*, or the *whole Old Testament* any thing but '*Phrases*,' '*independent Phrases*'? Or is you *Letter* it self any thing else but '*Phrases* tacked together?'

You conclude, that my "Definition of the Christians *Messias* is liable to "farther Difficulty". It seems I said, that *He is the Person by whom God will accomplish what he has spoken in the Prophets*. This you say is to "put that "into his Character, which can have no "weight with Deists; who probably will "not believe in him as characteris'd literally in the Old Testament, that is "yet to accomplish the Things spoken "therein.— Moreover, they will say "that the Scheme of making the Messiah "to have several Prophecies yet to accomplish, may probably be employed "by you — merely to solve Difficulties, "when you are not able, by the Arts of "Interpretation, to make a Prophecy to "square or agree in all its Parts, to the "Persons you would have it referred "to."

To this I say, when several Things at different Times to happen, are foretold concerning a particular Person, no more can be said to be accomplished, than is in Fact done; and the rest must be in Futurity

turity till the Time appointed shall come. When Jesus was upon Earth, He preached the Kingdom of Heaven to be *at Hand*; but did not preach to the *Gentiles*: Notwithstanding that the Messiah was prophesied of as a Person that was to be a *Light to the Gentiles*. Every one must judge from the Characters already fulfilled, whether it is reasonable to believe that other Characters will be likewise fulfilled. The *Jews* in our Saviour's Time, saw the Miracles which *Jesus* did; and they heard him declare himself to be *That Person* that was to *come into the World*, under the Character of *The Christ*. They were to judge from what was before them, whether he answer'd the Characters of *The Christ*, so far as he could in his Time. When afterwards the Gospel was preached to the *Gentiles*, additional Evidence arose; and People had a greater Degree of Assurance that Jesus was the Christ. When I add, that I believe *Jesus* will *judge the Quick and Dead*, or that the *Jews* will be converted, and *will look upon him whom they have pierced*:—This is not as you call it, “*merely to solve Difficulties*”, because I am “not able to make a Prophecy “square or agree in all its Parts to the “Person I would refer it to”: but it stands thus: — *Jesus* professed himself to be the Christ: He appeared in his Life and
Actions

Actions to be one *approved of God by the Signs and Wonders he did*; He has declared that all *Judgment* is committed to him; God has confirm'd all whatever *Jesus* has said *hitherto*; Therefore I *believe* he will confirm the rest: And if there be any Prophecy, or Part of one, not yet fulfilled, I therefore conceive that God will accomplish it by him, because he has already accomplished *much*. that *Jesus* said; and I cannot persuade my self that God would have countenanced an Impostor so far, if he would not accomplish what still remains.

Before I conclude, I'll add one thing which may be of some use to remark. The Religion of *Nature*, and that of *Jesus*, is exactly the same; the same Duties to be perform'd in both, except that in Christianity we have a particular Institution of what are usually called the *Two Sacraments*, and we are to *pray* to God *in the Name of Christ*. Virtue is the same in both Cases, of equal Extent, always to be prosecuted steadily and uniformly; and Vice of all kinds is always to be avoided. You will ask then, what is the Difference betwixt the *Law of Nature* and *Christianity*? I answer, Every Man, *as Man*, is subject to the *Law of Nature*, and accountable for Offences against it. But then, as God has discovered by the Prophets of the *Jews*, that He did design to send a particular Person into the World, to whom he

I would

would give Dominion, and through whom he would reward all truly virtuous Persons; *Christians* believe *Jesus* to be *that* Person: and by Means of the New Testament Revelation, they believe that this *Jesus* will *judge* Mankind, will *reward* every Man according to his Works, will *reign* till he has subdued all Enemies under his Feet, and till all Dominions or Rulers shall serve and obey God, &c. I do but just mention these Things, (which will require a more particular Discussion, and which perhaps I may some time or other lay before the World) that you may judge of Christianity from what the Scriptures have declared to be such, and not from any received Systems; That you may see that *Christianity* is perfectly rational and consistent throughout; That *Morality* is the same universally; That no Vice is patroniz'd by Christianity; and That whatever Notions prevail that encourage *Slavery*, or that are not strictly agreeable to *Virtue*, *Learning*, *Truth*, *Liberty*, *Peace*, and *Humanity*, are not *Christian* Notions, but the Mistakes of Christians.

I hope, SIR, I have omitted nothing in my Answer to you of any Moment. If I have, upon the least Intimation, you shall hear again from, SIR,

Your humble Servant,

June 24. 1727.

PHILALETHERS.

HAVING said incidentally, that “ it could
 “ never be proved that *Josephus* had no
 “ Expectation of a Messiah that should arise
 “ out of his Nation,” You attempt to disprove
 this Assertion in your Postscript. ’Tis strange,
 I think, that you should urge me with the Au-
 thority of Bishop *Chandler*, whose Authority, if
 you will admit in other Matters, then I’ll pro-
 mise you to admit it in the present. But I as-
 sure you, Sir, that tho’ I have a great Regard
 for that Learned Prelate’s Authority in proper
 Points; yet in an Affair of this kind, I neither
 quote any one to you, whom I desire you to re-
 ceive merely on that account; nor will I submit
 to any one whom you shall quote against me.
 The Passage of *Josephus* is in Bishop *Chandler*’s
 Words (if you like them best) thus, ‘ That
 ‘ which chiefly excited the Jews to War was an
 ‘ ambiguous Prophecy, which was found in the
 ‘ Sacred Books, that at that time some one within
 ‘ their Country shou’d arise, that should obtain
 ‘ the Empire of the whole World. For this
 ‘ they had receiv’d (by Tradition) that it was
 ‘ spoke of one of their own Nation, and many
 ‘ wise Men were deceived with the Interpreta-
 ‘ tion. But in truth, *Vespasian*’s Empire was
 ‘ designed in this Prophecy, who was created
 ‘ Emperor in *Judea*.’ What now is your Com-
 ment? ‘ Herein, say you, he plainly implies
 ‘ that the Prophecy, on which some Jews ground-
 ‘ ed their Notion of a Messias—was mistaken by
 ‘ them, and related not to such a Person.’ i. e.
 It did not relate to such a Person, as they con-
 ceiv’d the Messias. Well what then? “ It re-
 “ lated to *Vespasian*, who did not arise out of
 “ their

“*their Nation, but was created Emperor in Judaea.*”
 Do you not see, Sir, that the *Oracle* is declared
 by *Josephus* to be *ambiguous*? Wherein consists its
Ambiguity? Certainly in those Words, *arise out*
of their Nation: which either relate to a *Jew*
born; or may mean, as *Josephus* thought,
 One that is not a *Jew born*, but that *takes his*
beginning in their Nation, as *Vespasian* did who
 was created Emperor in *Judea*. Now if *Jose-*
phus interpreted the *ambiguous Oracle* in this
 latter Sense, then it follows plainly,

First, That *Josephus* had an Expectation of a
 Messiah that shou’d arise in his Sense out of his
 Nation, as well as the other *Jews*.

Secondly, That supposing he did relinquish
 the *National* Notion of a *Messias*, yet my Asser-
 tion is very true, that it can’t hence be proved,
 that *Josephus* had *no Expectation* of a *Messiah*,
 that shou’d arise out of his Nation. For it is
 very consistent to *relinquish the National Notion*,
 and yet to have *some Expectation* of a *Messiah*,
 as *Josephus* plainly had, who thought *Vespasian*
 to be the Man. *Josephus*, as well as the other
Jews, expected a *Messiah*; but *Josephus* inter-
 preted these Words, *ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*, from that
 Country, not as the Other *Jews* did: They un-
 derstanding them, as if the *Messias* were to be
 born in, *Josephus* understanding them as if it
 were sufficient to enter upon his Office, or Empire,
 in that Country.

F I N I S.